

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

1-3 (Canceled)

4. (Currently Amended)

~~The computer as claimed in Claim 3 in which~~ A computer provided with a word processing program comprising:

a syntax evaluation and amendment means adapted to identify predetermined syntax arrangements of groups of words formed into clauses or sentences in inputted text, and to provide alternative clauses or sentences in which the syntax arrangement of the group of words is different, where the inputted text is intended to advertise, promote or market goods or services,

the alternative syntax arrangements are adapted to enhance the capacity of the inputted text to promote said goods or services,

the syntax evaluation and amendment means is further adapted to identify predetermined characteristics of words or phrases in inputted sentences, and to provide words or phrases with alternative predetermined characteristics,

the syntax evaluation and amendment means is adapted to identify the following syntax arrangements in alternative and characteristics of words or phrases: Cause and Effect, Comparative Deletion, Complex Equivalent,

Conversational Postulate, Convincer Presupposition, Double Bind, Quotes, Lack of Referential Index, Lost Performative, Mind Read, Modal Operator, Nominalizations, Pacing Current Experience, Phonological Ambiguity, Presupposition, Punctuation Ambiguity, Selectional Restriction Violation, Scope Ambiguity, Syntax Ambiguity, Tag Question, Universal Quantifier, Unspecified Verbs, Utilisation, Visual Word, Kinesthetic Word, Auditory Word, Logical Word, as defined herein, and

each sentence is given a score according to the following formula:

| Syntax arrangement | If first identified arrangement | If second identified arrangement | If further identified arrangement |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Convincer presupposition | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Complex equivalent | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Cause and effect | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Nominalizations | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Presuppositions | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Tag questions | 5 | 2.5 | 1.75 |
| Comparative deletions | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Phonological ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Punctuation ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Scope ambiguities | 4 | | 1 |
| Syntax ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Double binds | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Modal operator | 3 | 1.5 | 0.75 |
| Universal quantifier | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Mind reads | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Lost performatives | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Visual word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Kinesthetic word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Auditory word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Logical word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Lack of referential index | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Unspecified verbs | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Conversational Postulates | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Extended Quotes | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Pacing Current Experience | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Selectional Restriction Violations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Utilisations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |

5. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 4 in which the score for a sentence derived from the first formula is effected by the score for the sentences on each side of the sentence.

6. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 4 in which the syntax evaluation and amendment means comprises a text amendment sub program comprising a text evaluation sub program, a target syntax arrangement and word type database, a dictionary, a thesaurus, an alternate syntax arrangement and word type database, and an alternative text generation sub program.

7. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 6 in which the text evaluation sub program is adapted to identify predetermined particular words or phrases in inputted sentences, in which said words or phrases are keywords relating to the characteristics of the goods or services to be promoted, action words relating to the actions the inputted text is intended to illicit, or synonyms for said words, and in which the text evaluation sub program is adapted to alter the score for each sentence according to the following formula:

| | Green | Amber | Red |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----|
| 1-49 sentences | 8 or more | 4-7 | 0.3 |

8. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 7 in which the text evaluation sub program is adapted to categories each sentence in the inputted text as red and requiring amendment, amber and requiring consideration of amendment, or green and requiring no amendment, and in which the thresholds for each category are set according to the following formula:

| | Green | Amber | Red |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------|-----|
| 1-49 sentences | 8 or more | 4-7 | 0.3 |
| 50-99 sentences | 6 or more | 2-5 | 0-1 |
| 100 or more sentences | 5 or more | 1-4 | 0 |

9. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 8 in which the alternative text generation sub program is adapted to provide alternative sentences provided with syntax arrangements, word or phrase types, or particular words or phrases, which provide the alternative sentence with a green score.

10. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 9 in which the text evaluation sub program is adapted to create a graph to represent the scores for each sentence in the inputted text, in which the horizontal axis of the graph lists the sentences in order, and the vertical axis lists the score.

11. (Previously Presented)

The computer as claimed in Claim 10 in which each horizontal point on the graph can be selected and dragged up to another point on the vertical axis, and in which the alternative text generation sub program generates an alternative sentence to replace the sentence which corresponds to the horizontal point, with a score which corresponds to the new vertical point on the graph.

12-13 (Canceled)

14. (Currently Amended)

A medium which holds thereon a program and/or data for enabling a computer to run a word processing program comprising a syntax evaluation and amendment means adapted to identify predetermined syntax arrangements of groups of words formed into clauses or sentences in inputted text,

and to provide alternative clauses or sentences in which the syntax arrangement of the group of words is different, where the inputted text is intended to advertise, promote or market goods or services, and the alternative syntax arrangements are adapted to enhance the capability of the inputted text to promote said goods or services, and in which said medium is computer processable,

the syntax evaluation and amendment means is further adapted to identify predetermined characteristics of words or phrases in inputted sentences, and to provide words or phrases with alternative predetermined characteristics,

the syntax evaluation and amendment means is adapted to identify the following syntax arrangements in alternative and characteristics of words or phrases: Cause and Effect, Comparative Deletion, Complex Equivalent, Conversational Postulate, Convincer Presupposition, Double Bind, Quotes, Lack of Referential Index, Lost Performative, Mind Read, Modal Operator, Nominalizations, Pacing Current Experience, Phonological Ambiguity, Presupposition, Punctuation Ambiguity, Selectional Restriction Violation, Scope Ambiguity, Syntax Ambiguity, Tag Question, Universal Quantifier, Unspecified Verbs, Utilisation, Visual Word, Kinesthetic Word, Auditory Word, Logical Word, as defined herein, and

each sentence is given a score according to the following formula:

| Syntax arrangement | If first identified arrangement | If second identified arrangement | If further identified arrangement |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Convincer presupposition | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Complex equivalent | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Cause and effect | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Nominalizations | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Presuppositions | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Tag questions | 5 | 2.5 | 1.75 |
| Comparative deletions | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Phonological ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Punctuation ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Scope ambiguities | 4 | | 1 |
| Syntax ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Double binds | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Modal operator | 3 | 1.5 | 0.75 |
| Universal quantifier | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Mind reads | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Lost performatives | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Visual word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Kinesthetic word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Auditory word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Logical word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Lack of referential index | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Unspecified verbs | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Conversational Postulates | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Extended Quotes | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Pacing Current Experience | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Selectional Restriction Violations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Utilisations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |

15. (Currently Amended)

A method of amending text intended to advertise or market goods or services including the steps:

1) identifying predetermined syntax arrangements of groups of words formed into clauses or sentences in the text;

2) providing alternative clauses or sentences, in which the syntax arrangement of the group of words is different, adapted to enhance the capability of the text to promote said goods or services,

3) identifying predetermined characteristics of words or phrases in inputted sentences, and providing words or phrases with alternative predetermined characteristics;

4) identifying the following syntax arrangements in alternative and characteristics of words or phrases: Cause and Effect, Comparative Deletion, Complex Equivalent, Conversational Postulate, Convincer Presupposition, Double Bind, Quotes, Lack of Referential Index, Lost Performative, Mind Read, Modal Operator, Nominalizations, Pacing Current Experience, Phonological Ambiguity, Presupposition, Punctuation Ambiguity, Selectional Restriction Violation, Scope Ambiguity, Syntax Ambiguity, Tag Question, Universal Quantifier, Unspecified Verbs, Utilisation, Visual Word, Kinesthetic Word, Auditory Word, Logical Word, as defined

Word, Logical Word, as defined herein; and

5) giving a score according to the following

formula:

| Syntax arrangement | If first identified arrangement | If second identified arrangement | If further identified arrangement |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Convincer presupposition | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Complex equivalent | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Cause and effect | 7 | 3.5 | 1.75 |
| Nominalizations | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Presuppositions | 6 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Tag questions | 5 | 2.5 | 1.75 |
| Comparative deletions | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Phonological ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Punctuation ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Scope ambiguities | 4 | | 1 |
| Syntax ambiguities | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Double binds | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Modal operator | 3 | 1.5 | 0.75 |
| Universal quantifier | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Mind reads | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Lost performatives | 2 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Visual word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Kinesthetic word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Auditory word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Logical word | 1 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Lack of referential index | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Unspecified verbs | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Conversational Postulates | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Extended Quotes | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Pacing Current Experience | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Selectional Restriction Violations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Utilisations | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |

16. (Currently Amended)

The method according to Claim 15 in which a computer provided with a word processing program according to Claim 1 is used to implement steps 1)-~~and 2)-~~4).